



zdw  
AF

[10191/2262]

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s) : Hubert Benzel et al.  
Serial No. : 10/070,286  
Filing Date : July 8, 2002  
For : METHOD FOR PRODUCING A  
SEMICONDUCTOR COMPONENT AND A  
SEMICONDUCTOR COMPONENT  
PRODUCED ACCORDING TO THE METHOD  
Group Art Unit : 1765

Examiner : Anita Karen Alonko  
Confirmation No. : 3055  
This correspondence is being deposited with the  
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail  
in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop AF**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on

Date: 3/15/2005

Signature: [Signature]

AARON C. DEDITCH

**TRANSMITTAL**

(33,865)

SIR:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified patent application is a  
Communication of the **STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW** as  
to the Summary of the Interview in the Final Office action of February 24, 2005. This is  
not the substantive response to the Final Office Action of 2/24/05 (which will follow at a later  
date).

While no fees are believed to be due, the Commissioner is authorized, as appropriate  
and/or necessary, to charge any fees (including any Rule 136(a) extension fees) or credit any  
overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600. A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is  
enclosed for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/15/2005

By: [Signature]

Richard L. Mayer  
(Reg. No. 22,490)

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

33,865  
Aaron C. Deditch



[10191/2262]

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s) : Hubert Benzel et al.  
Serial No. : 10/070,286  
Filing Date : July 8, 2002  
For : METHOD FOR PRODUCING A  
SEMICONDUCTOR COMPONENT AND A  
SEMICONDUCTOR COMPONENT  
PRODUCED ACCORDING TO THE METHOD

Group Art Unit : 1765

Examiner :

Confirmation No. :

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the  
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail  
in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on

**Mail Stop AF**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Date: 3/15/2005

Signature: AARON C. DEDITCH

AARON C. DEDITCH

(33,865)

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW,**  
**COMMUNICATION IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION of February 24, 2005**

SIR:

In response to the Interview Summary (for the examiner-initiated interview of February 22, 2005), all of which were mailed on February 24, 2005, our comments are as follows:

**Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.**

**REMARKS**

It is first noted that a substantive response to the 2/24/05 Office Action will follow this paper, since this paper is only a Communication as to the Substance of the 2/22/05 Interview.

As to the Interview, on February 22, 2005, Examiner Anita Karen Alonko initiated a phone call with Aaron C. Deditch (reg. no. 33,865) to offer proposed amendments to the claims by limiting the claims to annealing. Examiner Alonko advised that she would allow the case if the claims were so limited.

Agreement could not be reached however in view of the time constraints to respond.

It is noted that the Interview Summary form that was used was PTOL-413, which states that if a reply has already been filed Applicant is given one month from the Interview date (February 22, 2005) or one month from its mailing date (February 24, 2005), whichever is later.

However, since this was an Examiner initiated interview, it is respectfully submitted that PTOL-413B should have been used, and since the case was allowed, the first box of Part III of that form should have provided that Applicant did not need to provide a separate record of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the Application, and since the Examiner provided a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability (which was done here).

As explained above, the Examiner Amendment and Interview Summary is correct as to the fact that Applicants could not reach agreement as to limiting the claims to "annealing" to allow the case.

If Applicant had initiated the Interview, then PTOL-413 would have been the proper form to use.

The foregoing procedures are documented and explained in the M.P.E.P. At 713.04 (pages 700-182 to 700-186).

Since, however, the Examiner sent form PTOL-413, it is believed that this response satisfies the request for Applicant to file a Statement of the Substance of the Interview (see pages 700-184 and 700-185 of the M.P.E.P.).

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: 3/15/05 By: Richard L. Mayer  
Reg. No. 22,490  
KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
CUSTOMER NO 26646

*Handwritten:*  
Greg. inc.  
33,865  
Aaron C. Deditch